

June 2004

## SWORCS: A Work in Progress

Paul Jenkins

*The College of Mount St. Joseph*, paul\_jenkins@mail.msje.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Jenkins, Paul (2004) "SWORCS: A Work in Progress," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 16: Iss. 3, Article 9.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.4339>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact [epubs@purdue.edu](mailto:epubs@purdue.edu) for additional information.



## Planning a Prospective Shared... from page 28

collection. **SRLF** staff could follow standard routines to edit records to show location and owning unit. The working group saw no reason to physically house the collection together or to confer upon it the special protections of floor that housed rare materials. One issue that was not anticipated and will need to be addressed is how we alter the campus storage deposit quotas to make room for the steady stream of 10,000 items a year for the **Elsevier/ACM** pilot. Each campus is given a quota for deposits in the **RLFs**.

**Cataloging and data elements.** UC planners felt it was important to specify in **MELVYL**, the UC union catalog, that the shared copy was a part of the **UC Libraries Collection**. This issue of identifying a title as part of the new shared collection had not arisen with the shared digital acquisitions, because each local catalog had a bibliographic record that linked to the digital content as part of the "local" collection. The holdings record for the print issue, however, had to point to a \*physical\* location and \*owning\* unit, being **SRLF** and **UC Libraries** respectively. It was also important to clarify in the public display that the copies had restricted use and loan periods. Once a unique location code was assigned to the shared **Elsevier** copies, all kinds of possibilities for display and limiting were possible: Because the **University of California Libraries (UCL)** copy was restricted use, should it display as the last holding in the **MELVYL** catalog? When a user limits his/her

search to a specific campus can the **UCL** copy display as part of that limited search. In spite of the ability to display collective ownership through a note field in the **MELVYL** record, most campuses still wanted to create a mechanism and work flow to add the holdings \*information\* on these shared print copies to their individual catalogs. This was driven by a desire to enable users of local campus catalogs to find the print copy when searching locally. We needed to refer to the cataloging experts in charge of developing guidelines for campuses to add holding information to local catalogs.

**Preservation.** There is no doubt that we made compromises in the level of security and preservation treatment assigned to the shared collection. Why were we willing to make these compromises? We felt that the print copies would be borrowed infrequently because electronic access existed and we could rely on campus redundancy as a source for fill-ins or replacement of damaged or missing issues. We also had faith in our normal claiming procedures to fill in gaps. We had no intention of defining the print collections as the "copy of record" or "last copy" for the UC system, since we were creating a hybrid archive that would allow for "controlled circulation." The decision was made to not bind the issues in the shared print collection in order to facilitate scanning and photocopying. Because we had eliminated the main preservation measure for journals, binding, we built in a new processing step. Upon receipt issues were put into archival envelopes and other types of archival enclosures before transportation to the **SRLF**.

## Implementation and Assessment

**UCLA** began creating check-in records for the **Elsevier** shared print issues in May 2003 and processing issues in July. **CDC** appointed an assessment team to evaluate the effectiveness and outcome of the pilot. University Librarians particularly are concerned whether such a collaborative effort will scale and is cost effective. As the pilot has unfolded some outstanding issues have surfaced. It is clear that we need to develop a set of preservation policies to govern shared print collections that meet the particular type of collection and the behavior we expect out of it. We also realized that we had not written policies for campus staff to follow in mediating the requests for the restricted materials. In retrospect we should have included an ILL expert, who knew the **MELVYL** infrastructure for borrowing, on the working group. **CDC** has already had discussions on how the building and behavior of a shared collection will be specific to the characteristics of the materials. We are eagerly anticipating the report of the **Elsevier/ACM** pilot from the assessment team that has been evaluating the procedures, workflows, and costs. **UC** is signing second and third generation licenses with additional journal publishers that include provision of a single print copy for the system. Concurrently, we are struggling to find time to step back and define the broad goals and vision of a shared collection. We expect the pilot results will both help refine the procedures for UC's first category of shared collections and clarify our broader goals in the uncharted waters of prospective shared print. 🍌

## SWORCS: A Work in Progress

by **Paul Jenkins** (Director of Library Services at the College of Mount St. Joseph, Cincinnati, Ohio) <paul\_jenkins@mail.msjs.edu>

Since the days of the **Farmington Plan** (established in 1942), librarians have chased the holy grail of cooperative collection development with little success. This ambitious plan fell into disuse in the early 1970s thanks in part to reductions in materials budgets, poor administration, and growing confusion as to its actual mission.<sup>1</sup> In 2002, I proposed a much less ambitious scheme: to see if five **OhioLINK** institutions could effectively work together to purchase books in religions outside the Judeo-Christian tradition in order to reduce unnecessary duplication of titles. While much smaller in scope than the **Farmington Plan**, our project faces many of the same challenges.

Dubbed **SWORCS** (**Southwestern Ohio Religious Cooperative**), our plan has experienced a lengthy gestation period, and we have encountered some of the same difficulties which doomed the national project. The germ of the idea sprang from a comment heard at an **OhioLINK** committee meeting that the consortium's subject groups (Art, Biology, etc.) should be more actively promoting cooperative collection development. Instead of continuing unnecessary duplication of titles in subject ar-

reas, why not purchase titles outside the core held by few or no consortium members? Since my institution, the **College of Mount St. Joseph** (Catholic, enrollment of 2,000), is one of four in the immediate Cincinnati area with a religious affiliation, I sensed an opportunity. Could librarians from a small group of religious institutions attempt a cooperative collection development project in the field of religious studies which might serve as a model for later statewide application?

The first schools I contacted were **Xavier University** (Catholic, enrollment of 4,000), the **University of Dayton** (Catholic, enrollment of 7,000), and **Cincinnati Bible College** (Protestant, enrollment of 600). As I contemplated an agenda for our first meeting in June, 2002 I reflected on the fact that if our schools shared similar heritages, we varied greatly in terms of collection size and annual materials budgets. Dayton's budget in Religious Studies, for example, is roughly ten times greater than my institution can afford. Ensuring that each member would play a viable role in the group would be a challenge. I also wanted to make it clear from the start that though I was the impetus

behind the group I had no clear idea of exactly how we might proceed.

At our first meeting we determined that any cooperative ventures should concentrate on improving holdings in religions outside the Judeo-Christian tradition. Core collections in this area must continue to be developed locally. Indeed, it seems clear to me that cooperative collection development in any discipline will succeed only in areas peripheral to the core. Other topics discussed at the June meeting included creating a union serials list for the group, identifying member institutions' relative collection strengths in the areas of Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism, identifying titles in these religions not owned by any **OhioLINK** member, finding and addressing gaps in religious monographic series, conducting a conspectus study for the group, investigating whether similar projects were afoot in other state consortia, and finally what sort of usage reports in the area

*continued on page 32*





ever, was the suggestion that **Cedarville College** (Baptist, enrollment 3,000) be added to the group. This seemed a clear indication that though we were still in search of a specific mission, members agreed that the idea had potential.

We met for a second time two months later. A compiled union list of religious studies serials was shared, but the group quickly determined we should initially concentrate our efforts on book collections. Three members who had participated in the **WLN Conspectus** in the early 1990's as part of the **Greater Cincinnati Library Consortium** did not recommend its use for our project. We chose to adopt a less formal approach by simply sharing the number of books each member's library owned in Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism. Would it not make sense, we argued, that those collections already strong in these areas continue to "carry the ball" for other members of the group? After looking at the numbers it became clear that these three religions were already being covered in relative strength. We realized that we must concentrate on religions outside the Judeo-Christian tradition with fewer adherents such as Confucianism, Sikhism, Taoism, Shinto, Jainism, Bahai, Zoroastrianism, Rastafarianism, Tenrikyo, and various African Religions.

Another major topic at this meeting was the possible formation of an approval plan based on the group's needs. Since **OhioLINK** had previously chosen **Yankee Book Peddler (YBP)** as its approval plan vendor, we would pursue the idea with them. The major benefit of this approach would be that via **YBP's Gobi2** product, group members would be able to see online which other **OhioLINK** schools might already have selected a title in these areas for purchase. Such knowledge would greatly reduce the level of unnecessary duplication of titles. Since **OhioLINK** had recommended but not mandated adoption of **YBP**, not all of the group's members had signed on with them. Convinced of its benefit to the project, however, these schools indicated their willingness to make the change. This stance was another clear indication that our group was taking its task seriously. A further sign of good health was that **Miami University** (enrollment 15,000) expressed an interest in joining **SWORCS**. Miami would be both the first state university and the first institution with no religious affiliation to join. It would also bring to the group the largest collection and biggest book budget.

The major subject of our third meeting (November, 2002) was a question we had all been afraid to ask: how would we divide fiscal responsibility for any purchases made by group members? Should we each attempt to earmark a certain percentage of our book budget? This approach would ensure that the smaller members would retain an active role. Alternatively, might each school commit \$1,000 to the project in the initial year of purchases? Complicating matters, of course, was the fact that none of us knew how many books would meet our still undetermined selection criteria. The matter was tabled for the time being. We did not expect to create the perfect beast from the start. The fact that we could agree on general philosophy and "big picture" decisions ensured that we did not get bogged down too early in the process by its details. We also debated the question of whether to receive books or merely slips for titles identified by our approval plan profiles. The group quickly agreed that, at least initially, it would be best to start with slips.

It is worthwhile to note here that cooperation by **OhioLINK** staff has been an important element of any success the group has achieved to date. At the November meeting we requested that the **OhioLINK** staff member who had volunteered to attend our meetings run a report that would list unfilled **P-Circ** (patron-initiated borrowing) requests in the area of religious studies. We thus hoped to identify titles that had been requested by patrons but which had not been delivered due to lack of available copies.

At our fourth meeting (March, 2003), nine months into the project, we finally agreed to name the project **SWORCS**. More importantly, we now felt ready to formally issue a mission statement which read as follows: "a.) to apply cooperative collection development principles in our libraries in order to reduce duplication of titles and better cover religions outside the Judeo-Christian tradition; b.) specifically, to create a shared slip approval plan profile for these religions that might serve as a model for similar statewide projects in

might be available from the **OhioLINK** office.

Most important, how-

other disciplines." A representative from **YBP** attended the meeting and effectively outlined how he felt our needs might best be met by his company via use of its **Gobi2** product, specifically designed to enable online sharing of acquisitions information between participating libraries. Such collaboration, we agreed, would be vital to any success **SWORCS** might enjoy.

We had still not definitely determined which schools would cover which religions. Budget issues still loomed, as well as the question of how to sell the program to our faculties. How would they feel once they knew we would be purchasing books, in essence, for the consortium rather than strictly for our own collections? How would they feel if the **SWORCS** project affected the local materials budget to the extent that a title they recommended might not be purchased? Again, at this time any answers to such concerns remain unaddressed.

By our fifth meeting (August, 2003) we finally felt ready to assign religions to specific institutions. The assignments were as follow:

**Cedarville:** Unitarianism, Scientology, Atheism

**Cincinnati Bible:** Sikhism, Jainism

**College of Mount St. Joseph:** Bahai, Zoroastrianism, Rastafarianism

**Dayton:** Taoism

**Miami:** Tenrikyo and Shinto

**Xavier:** Confucianism

These assignments were largely based on existing collection strengths and size of book budgets of the group members. The smaller members were given a number of religions for which we felt a smaller number of desirable titles would be available.

Another major hurdle was cleared at the same meeting when each member committed a maximum of \$500 to make purchases for the **SWORCS** project in fiscal 2003-2004. A further decision was reached to spend this money in the first year of the project only on retrospective purchases. Members felt they were not yet ready to commit to the purchase of current titles based on the embryonic state of both their approval plan profiles and **YBP's Gobi2** product. Purchase of current titles would begin in fiscal 2004-2005.

Such was the state of the project when I introduced it to other consortium members at **OhioLINK's Cooperative Collection Development Summit** in December, 2003. Audience questions abounded, which we took as a good sign. Happily the group gained another member at the meeting, **Wittenberg University**. Thus what had begun as a venture specific to institutions within 50 miles of Cincinnati now included two members nearly as far away as 100. While modest, such expansion suggests that our goal of providing a model for similar ventures on a consortium-wide scale may be reasonable.

At the December summit, our representative from **Cedarville** informed me that she would like to change her institution's subject responsibility. Since books published by evangelical publishers such as **Baker Book House**, **Eerdmans**, and **Intervarsity** are of strong interest to **Cedarville** faculty and students, could she forsake her original assignment of Unitarianism, Scientology, and Atheism and tackle this area instead? Even though this request represented a shift away from our mission, group members proved willing to accommodate it. A project in its infancy will surely face further revisions and continue to evolve before a more permanent mission is established.

Following the summit I distributed a survey via **OhioLINK's Collection Development** listserv designed to reinforce our notion that non-Christian religions were important to religious studies bibliographers and selectors throughout the state. Recipients were asked to assign a rating to sixteen non-Christian religions using the following designations:

- 1 = course taught at my institution devoted entirely to this religion;
- 2 = course taught at my institution that includes coverage of this religion;
- 3 = this religion is not covered directly in our curriculum but is still important;
- 4 = no need for the **OhioLINK** central catalog to support this religion.


*continued on page 34*



Eighteen **OhioLINK** members responded. The results of the survey were as follows:

Religion	Mode	Average Rating
African Religions	2	2.00
Atheism	3	2.60
Bahai	3	2.67
Buddhism	1	1.67
Confucianism	2	1.94
Hinduism	2	1.83
Islam	1	1.44
Jainism	2	2.31
Rastafarianism	3	2.81
Scientology	3	3.00
Shinto	2	2.24
Sikhism	2	2.38
Taoism	2	2.06
Tenrikyo	3	3.00
Unitarianism	3	2.50
Zoroastrianism	3	2.81

Clearly, then, there does seem good reason to purchase books in all of these areas. Thirteen of the sixteen faiths listed above received at least one rating of 1. Respondents also identified a number of other religions and sects covered in their curricula. These included Hare Krishna, New Age, Native American religions, Shamanism, Spiritualism, Sufism, and Vajrayana. There is certainly room for expanded coverage.

As I write, we are about to make our first purchases for **SWORCS**. Fiscal 04-05 should prove a pivotal year in the project. The degree of success we have in establishing good approval plan profiles will prove crucial. Communication between members of the group must continue, and we must advertise our mission throughout the **OhioLINK** community in order to encourage similar ventures. Whether **SWORCS** meets the same fate as the **Farmington Plan** and other attempts at cooperative collection development remains to be seen. What is certain, however, is that the desire to work together exists. Stay tuned. 

#### Endnotes

1. Gaines, Abner J. (1994). *Farmington Plan*. In Wayne A. Wiegand & Donald G. Davis (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Library History* (p.193). New York and London: Garland Publishing.

## CTW — Early Explorations and New Directions

by **Marian Shilstone** (Director, Information Resources, Information Services, Connecticut College) <mrshi@conncoll.edu>

In 1984, under the leadership of **Brian Rogers**, **Ralph Emerick** and **Robert Adams**, **Connecticut College**, **Trinity College** and **Wesleyan University** formed the **CTW Consortium** to purchase a shared integrated library system (**Notis**) and to establish a program for reciprocal borrowing of the collections represented in the consortial catalog. Early cooperative efforts among the three libraries centered on acquisitions procedures and common workflow issues. But after the consortium migrated to the **Sirsi** system in 1995, staff began to consider the potential benefits of cooperating more closely on building shared collections to maximize available resources. In March 1997, the three **CTW** directors established a **CTW Collection Development Committee** and charged the group with examining options for the joint acquisition of resources. The group's efforts very quickly veered off into two distinct directions. The first, the consortial purchase of electronic databases desired by all three libraries, has been quite successful. In all, we have negotiated licenses for 20 electronic databases since the group was formed. For a few of these we have now joined larger groups to enhance the discount — most notably the **Oberlin Group** and **Nelinet**. However, we still maintain consortial subscriptions to 13 databases with considerable savings over individual subscriptions.

The second area of interest to the group grew out of the fact that all three libraries maintained approval plans with a common vendor, **Yankee Book Peddler**. In November 1996, prior to the development of our formal collection development committee, our vendor representative, **Ruth Fischer** (now of **R2 Consulting**), completed an analysis of our three separate approval profiles and our purchase patterns for the months of August through October of 1996. At the time, **Yankee** was beginning to develop an interest in the concept of consortia profiling and was planning a discussion group at **ALA Midwinter** in January. My two **CTW** colleagues in collection development, **Ed Allen** at **Wesleyan** and **Doris Kammratt** at **Trinity**, and I had enjoyed a cordial and cooperative working relationship for a number of years. While we had no "formal" collecting agreements, we had developed some understanding of areas of strength in the three collections. **Wesleyan** had particularly strong collections in medieval studies, classics, gay & lesbian studies, and ethnomusicology, to name a few. **Trinity's**

collections reflected the only engineering program in the consortium along with strong collections in Latin American literature, language & cognition, ethics, and ornithology. **Connecticut College** had well-developed collections in the fine arts, Irish history, ecology and environmental studies, child and family studies and North American archaeology. **Ed, Doris** and I would often confer on major purchases by telephone or, preferably, over lunch at a good restaurant! And so we were eager to work with **Ruth** on a more systematic analysis of our collecting patterns. This initial analysis yielded some surprising results and some expected results. Since all three of our institutions are liberal arts institutions with similar core curricula, the publishers covered in our plans were comparable, although **Wesleyan**, with the largest acquisitions budget, had the largest coverage of publishers. Surprisingly, however, an analysis of the titles supplied during the study revealed the extent to which our collections were, indeed, unique. In all,

of the 894 titles acquired by the three libraries during the three months, 620, or 69%, were unique to one library. Because this was not a catalog overlap study and could simply reflect different buying schedules, we did a subsequent study covering a full year, from July '96 through June '97. The results of this later study showed 56% unique titles purchased within the consortium (51% at **CC**, 47% at **TC** and 65% at **WU**) during that period. So it was clear that to some extent our historic collecting patterns differed enough based on local needs to offer significant resources to our partners within the consortium.

Over the years, **CTW** circulation figures have reinforced the mutual support provided by our consortial collections. Although **Connecticut College** has the smallest collection and acquisitions budget of the three, we have more than held our own in providing resources to our partners. In some years we have actually lent more than we have borrowed within the consortium. Anecdotal evidence suggests that much of our resource sharing involves core titles with multiple copies within **CTW**. This became a central question when we began to consider a more formal collecting agreement in the spring of 1997.

In May of '97, **Ed, Doris** and I met specifically to discuss the possibility of constructing a consortial approval profile and to prepare for a meeting with **Ruth Fischer** in July. We reviewed the data **Ruth** had sup-

*continued on page 36*

